

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR'S COMMISSION FOR ONE CALIFORNIA

“Diversity in the Entertainment Industry”

**September 28, 1999
Los Angeles, CA**

LT. GOVERNOR CRUZ BUSTAMANTE: It's wonderful to see everybody here today. Thank you all for coming. This is the first meeting of the Commission for One California, and I'd like to start by thanking each and every commissioner for taking the time to be a part of this very important event.

Today, business and community leaders, law enforcement officers, and academics will begin to study ways in which we can help our fellow citizens learn to live together as one California.

I can't imagine more important work. Throughout our history, the key to California's extraordinary success has been its diversity. Men and women of different races and cultures, religions and orientations, have come together to enrich this unique place. Immigrants from other parts of the United States and from other parts of the world have made invaluable and countless contributions. Our state's university system is the best public institution of higher education because it attracts diverse students and scholars. And through my conversations with each of you, I know that you share my commitment to finding real solutions to promote the understanding of diversity. Because promoting and understanding diversity is our best hope for increasing tolerance in our society, we must begin the process to find common ground.

Today's agenda is dedicated to an important issue. How diversity is portrayed in the media plays an important role in how we look at one another, how we treat one another, and how we live together. As the father of three daughters and two grandchildren, I want to determine whether there is concern that we are polarizing the TV audience, especially our children, and, in turn, unwittingly contributing to intolerance.

We all know there is a very limited portrayal of diversity in network programming, and when you do see diversity, just as often as not, the portrayals rely on stereotypes. How all segments of society are portrayed or not portrayed on television, in the movies, throughout the

media, not only affects public perception, it provides a window on the entertainment industry's view of society.

It can be tough to find programs that portray positive role models. It seems impossible to find characters that look like all of California. I hope we can start the dialogue to generate ideas: how the entertainment industry can create positive role models for Californians, especially our youth.

We are joined today by several representatives of the entertainment industry to discuss diversity and the media. I'd like to thank them for coming, for being courageous, in some cases to come and to be the only representative of certain parts of the industry. Representatives of all the major studios were in fact invited but declined to attend.

Thank you again for coming. I'm looking forward to a very productive time of discussion. And at this time I'd like to introduce Rabbi Abraham Cooper. Rabbi Cooper, the Associate Dean of the Simon Wiesenthal Center and Museum of Tolerance, has so graciously agreed to be here at our meeting in Rabbi Hier's place and to be the host of today's meeting.

Rabbi Cooper.

RABBI ABRAHAM COOPER: Thank you, Lieutenant Governor, and on behalf Rabbi Hier, he sends his greetings from the Holy City of Jerusalem this morning. And Leba Geft, who is right here behind us -- if she could raise her hand -- the director of our museum, will be leading the tour of the Museum of Tolerance following the program.

I want to welcome everyone and also just to ask everyone that before you speak to identify yourself because we are running a tape of the proceedings. And starting tomorrow morning we're going to be posting online at Wiesenthal.com this morning's discussions for those members of the entertainment community who couldn't make it here. They'll be able to just use a local phone, to just go to Wiesenthal.com, and perhaps they'll gain some additional and important perspective.

Today happens to be the middle of the Succot Festival, the Jewish holiday of Succot. It's actually our thanksgiving holiday. Some of you may know, and may see some of your neighbors in the valley on the west side, that during the course of this week many of us actually move out of our homes into what's called a succah. A succah is a kind of rickety booth that in a sense is earthquake proof, but that's not the reason we're out there this week. It's just an extra bonus.

It is a statement that we've been making through our faith the last few thousand years; that in the bad times, and especially in the good, we step out of our beautiful homes for a week to try to live in this booth, where you can see the stars and maybe be uncomfortable with the flies and the bees, as a reminder that as sturdy as our homes, lifestyles, and societies may seem at a particular time, the truth is that we're living collectively in a succah, in a rickety booth.

We talk about the pillars that make up the booth, the wonderful booth, the succah of California. Obviously, diversity is one of those pillars, along with tolerance and education.

Later on, when you visit the museum downstairs, you will be reminded, of course, that there should be no diversity in fighting hatred, less diversity in the quality of education, and that entertainment and the media set the table in our succah. You set the menu, you set the table, and more often than not you get plenty of the blame.

So we're honored here at the Wiesenthal Center, the Museum of Tolerance, where we believe that hate is an acquired taste and unlearning hate is also a real possibility. We're in it for the long haul, together with everyone who's shown up here. And we, once again, want to commend the Lieutenant Governor for taking on a pretty tough issue, and we wish great success for this meeting and the future course of this Commission.

Thank you.

LT. GOVERNOR BUSTAMANTE: Thank you, Rabbi Cooper.

I hope that the commissioners, if you have time this afternoon, take the time to actually tour the museum. I don't know if anybody has planned to do it, but they'd like to get sort of a count. So by raising your hands, could I see the number of people that are planning to go to the tour this afternoon? Eight. Great, thank you.

Before we begin our panel discussion, we have an opportunity to have a brief lesson by a person who is a very well known expert on California. We're very, very fortunate to have him as a member of our Commission. It is Dr. Kevin Starr, who is the State Librarian of California.

Dr. Starr.

DR. KEVIN STARR: Thank you, Lieutenant Governor.

In considering the question of diversity in California, we can begin with a very positive statement: California has always been diverse. It is part of the DNA code of California, if you will, to be diverse. That diversity, of course, has not always gone hand in hand with a just and

equitable society. Far from it. But that diversity has endured and it is now the social and cultural matrix for California as California enters the new millenium.

In the Native American era, which extended for some 25 generations across more than 1500 years, more than a third of the Native Americans living within the present day boundaries of the United States lived in the region which we today call California. Those Native Americans, moreover, were divided into some 100 tribal groupings and spoke some 80 different languages belonging to five of the major North American language families.

For a millenium and a half, in other words, California enjoyed an incredible diversity of Native American peoples and languages, extending from the Tolowa, Yurok, Chimariko, Whilkuts, and Hupa of the north to the Cahuilla, Kamia, Yuma, and Mohave of the south. In present day Santa Barbara and Ventura counties, the Chumash took to the seas in their long canoes. On the eastern side of the Sierra Nevada, the Panamint and the Shoshone crossed and re-crossed the Sierra Nevada. Each Native American people, moreover, sustained different or variable traditions in religious beliefs, healing practices, communal and family lifestyles.

When Spain came to Alta California in 1769, Spain brought with it the racial and ethnic diversity of the Spanish frontier. To be Spanish was to be a full subject of the Crown. It was not an ethnic identity. And besides, in the vice royalty of Mexico, responsible for settling Alta California, a rich diversity of racial and ethnic heritages already obtained.

In September 1781, some 218 years to the day, Spain (meaning the vice royalty of Mexico) established Los Angeles as a pueblo; one of the first and few settlements in Spanish California to be given full civic identity. If those first Los Angelenos were in this room with us today, they would seem European, African, Native American, or mixtures thereof in their descent. Yet, each person would describe himself or herself, whatever the color of their skin, as subjects of the Spanish Crown.

Mexican California, following Mexico's break with Spain in the early 1820s, was an even more polyglot and multi-ethnic affair. There were Mexican Californians of Spanish descent, mixed Spanish and Indian descent, mixed Spanish, Indian and African descent. There were even a few Filipinos, called Luzon Indians, or Manilla Men, who would sail across the Pacific in one of the great galleons that left the Philippines each year for Mexico. Already, Americans, English, French, Russians, and Alaskan Aleuts could be found in Alta California. The Russians operated out of Fort Ross, north of San Francisco Bay.

Increasingly, starting in the 1830s, more and more Americans were in residence in Mexican California. The first American to settle here, however, was not an Anglo American but an African American who adopted the Spanish name “Juan Cristobal.”

The Gold Rush, which followed the American annexation of California in 1846, was an intrinsically internationalist event. Indeed, the Gold Rush represented the most extensive and intensive multi-ethnic, multicultural encounter thus far experienced by Anglo America.

From Mexico and Chile came skilled miners who imparted the technology of mining to Anglo-American miners from the eastern states. Thousands of miners came from France and Germany, countries destabilized by the revolutions of 1848.

Slowly at first but then with growing numbers came the Chinese, both to work in the mines and later to achieve the heroic work of spanning the Sierra Nevada with the railroad track. In Weaverville and Trinity County in the early to mid 1850s, some 5,000 Chinese miners would converge each year for festival rights and celebrations, centered on the Weaverville Joss House, still standing under the care of the California Department of Parks and Recreation.

In the post-Gold Rush era, California even further diversified itself. Throughout the 1850s and ‘60s, numerous Irish immigrants migrated to the state via New York. Anglo Americans from the Midwest flocked into Southern California in the 1880s. In the 1890s, Mexicans migrated into Southern California to build the rail lines for the big Red Cars. Starting in 1898 and rising steadily thereafter was an influx of Japanese immigrants, a population which grew even more rapidly after the arrival of thousands of Japanese picture brides in the 1920s. Other turn of the century immigrant groups included the Italians, Germans, Swedes, Dalmatians, who poured steadily into the state, especially the Bay Area, in the 1885-1920 era.

The 1920s also witnessed a second influx of Mexicans into the fields of California where they joined the Filipinos, the Japanese, the Sikhs and other peoples already working there. Armenians meanwhile, fleeing the persecutions of Europe, were settling in the Great Central Valley.

By the early 1900s, San Francisco had a higher proportion of foreign-born residents relative to its total population than any city in the United States, including New York. That population included the first Korean immigrants to California, harbingers of a migration that would more than a half century later make Los Angeles the second or third largest Korean city on the planet.

San Francisco's considerable German-Jewish and Sephardic-Jewish colony, meanwhile, which migrated to Los Angeles in the 1850s as well, was augmented at the turn of the century by a large influx of Eastern European Jews; and this population in turn was augmented even further in the 1930s by refugees from fascist Europe until Los Angeles emerged as one of the two or three most important centers of Jewish civilization on the planet.

In the 1930s as well, more than a million and a half Anglo Americans from the Dust Bowl states flocked to California. John Steinbeck's *The Grapes of Wrath* is their story.

There had always been a sizable African-American population in California from the Gold Rush onward, but the Second World War brought hundreds of thousands of African Americans to California to work in the shipyards and other aspects of defense work.

It would exhaust us to chronicle the groups who poured into California after the reform of federal immigration law in the mid-1960s and as a result of the wars and the political upheavals of the past three decades.

Is there any people on the planet, any language, any religion, not represented in California this very morning? The one hundred-plus languages spoken by children in our public schools in addition to English speaks for itself.

This then -- diversity -- is the persistent DNA code of California. It goes without saying that all these groups were not treated fairly when they arrived or even long after they had arrived. But even as we focus upon the injustices and mistreatment, the insensitivities and outright racism, we must keep in mind some simple points: California has always been diverse, no one group has ever driven another group out of California, although many of them have tried.

California, in other words, has never truly been fully worthy of its diversity, and we still have a long way to go. Yet, we members of the Lieutenant Governor's Commission for One California would make a mistake if we ignored the fact that diverse California has always been diverse and California always will be diverse. Diversity is fundamental to the human culture of this region. This Commission, in my opinion, would make a mistake if it ignored the positive impact of this century's long diversity.

Our history includes many horrors: the decimation of the Native American population, for example; the incarceration of Japanese-American citizens during World War II, strictly on the basis of their ethnicity; the exploitation of Mexican field workers; and before that, the unjust

abrogation of Mexican land titles by the Land Act of 1851. Most racial and ethnic groups in our state can point to a time when they were treated terribly. For some, that bad treatment continues.

This Commission, as I understand it, will address continuing errors and deficiencies in our statewide behavior. But if it only does that, it will in significant measure, in my opinion, miss the point. We must never forget the fact that history has brought us here together and has always brought us here together. We are different but we belong to each other in the most profound of ways. We are Americans together, we are Californians together. Let's learn how to do it better. Let's learn how to fulfill that most persistent of traits in the California DNA code -- diversity -- by creating a truly ecumenical civilization here on the sunny and beautiful Pacific shores.

LT. GOVERNOR BUSTAMANTE: Thank you. That was very nice. You lived up totally to your reputation.

DR. STARR: Well, I'm sitting next to one of my bosses.

LT. GOVERNOR BUSTAMANTE: Also today we are joined by Greg Braxton of the *LA Times*. Mr. Braxton reports about the entertainment industry. He is very knowledgeable about the subject of diversity in the entertainment industry, and if you would, Mr. Braxton, if you could share with us the press's perspective about this issue.

MR. GREG BRAXTON: Thank you. Good morning, everyone.

I want to start out by sort of warning you I'm a little bleary because I've been watching what seems to be an obscene amount of television over the last few weeks. It's sort of my media curse to look at television so I can evaluate it and write about it for the *LA Times*. And I've had to pay extra close attention lately because of all the new shows, the new fall shows, that are premiering and vying for that brass ring of popularity that will earn huge advertising revenues and the perpetual run in syndication.

So in watching this obscene amount of television, I've come across this one commercial, which seems to run every 30 seconds or so, that makes me want to take a hammer to the television. It's a commercial for a three-letter clothing store, I will refuse to name, but I'm sure many of you have seen it. It shows a group of young people staring at the camera, looking either extremely bored or extremely put upon. Some have their arms defiantly crossed and they're singing, "I just can't get enough, I just can't get enough."

Now, these are all extremely attractive kids. They can obviously afford fashionable clothes and they have pretty decent voices. And this uncontrollable urge wells up inside me and I find myself screaming at the set, “Why the hell are you so pissed off?” And I find myself reaching for a blunt instrument before reason takes over.

But as furious as this commercial makes me, I also realize something about it, and that this ad, and this whole ad campaign by this particular clothing chain, shows a diverse group of young people coexisting in their boredom -- black and white together. There might even be some other cultural groups represented in these ads. I can’t tell because of all the blasted MTV style editing. I know there have been Latinos and Asians in other ads by this group.

My point is this: This campaign reflects and represents more cultural diversity in 30 seconds than you’re likely to see in almost all of the new shows premiering this fall on the four major networks. When it comes to cultural diversity, ABC, Fox, NBC, and CBS apparently can get enough.

The *LA Times* broke the story last May that out of the 26 new comedies and dramas premiering on the major four networks this season, not one features a minority in a lead role. We might find a sprinkling of black actors and actresses on these programs, but you would be hard pressed to find any Latinos. Asians and Native Americans are pretty much invisible.

Well, let’s look at some of the other numbers involving some of the more veteran shows, shows that have been on for a while. The number of minorities in a leading role on Fox shows: zero. The number of minorities in a leading role on NBC shows: zero. The number of minorities in a leading role on ABC shows: there’s one: D.L. Hughley. The number of minorities on CBS shows: three, and two of them are Bill Cosby. And moving beyond leading roles, let’s look at some of the ensemble shows that’ll be hitting your living rooms this fall.

There’s a new show called *Wasteland*, which is set in New York, about a group of twenty-somethings and their journey to adulthood. The group is all white. There’s a show called *The West Wing*, a behind-the-scenes look at the White House, a liberal White House. The cast is all white. There’s a show coming on around the mid-season called *Manchester Prep* about a prep school in New York. This young cast is all white. There’s a show called *Freaks and Geeks*, which just premiered last Saturday on NBC, about a group of teens attending a suburban high school in the 1980s. This cast is all white. There’s a show called *Cold Feet*, which

premiered last Friday, about three couples, sort of yuppie couples in varying and differing stages of relationships. The cast is -- well, you get the drift.

This is coming after a season where there were huge hits like *ER*, *Ally McBeal*, *Touched by an Angel*, *The Practice*, *Law and Order*, *NYPD Blue*. All these shows had culturally diverse casts and audiences just flock to them. Yet, this season the pendulum on these four networks seemed to have swung in the other direction, and we are close to having an all-white landscape on these new fall shows. It has fallen to The WB and UPN to have any shows which reflect any cultural flavor and diversity.

This phenomenon happened without anyone within the executive offices of the networks or affiliated agencies taking any notice or making any sort of action. Now, it wasn't until the *Times* published its first article that people within the industry started to notice that something looked a little funny. This phenomenon also occurred during a time when there seems to be increased diversity within the motion picture industry. It's occurring a lot more slowly, but at least if you go to the films, you see that something does seem to be changing, that there does seem to be more of a reflection of diversity and multiculturalism.

Even after the *Times* published its first article, there was slow movement to rectify the situation until the NAACP, which was prompted by the coverage in the *Times*, denounced the networks and called television "the last bastion of racism in this country."

So what happened, and is anything being done about it? The networks point fingers at the advertisers as they pursue a young and affluent demographic. The advertisers blame the network, saying they'll buy ads on anything that is a hit, and adding that they can only buy what the networks bring to them.

As one ad buyer said in our initial story, the networks feel they have no financial incentive to increase diversity on shows, because minorities will watch television no matter what. So it really doesn't make any sense for them to go out of their way to increase cultural diversity.

It's also hard to say how seriously the television industry is taking this discussion. On one hand, there does seem to be an attempt to increase at least the number of black faces on some of the new shows this fall -- and that's a development I want to address in a few minutes -- along with the fact that there are several deals with minority talent that are being publicized by the networks. On the other hand, the momentum before increasing multiculturalism on television

seems to be winding down. Even just a few weeks after this story broke and at this early point of the season, I see there's almost a total lack of network representation today.

Last week the subject of cultural diversity came up at a luncheon of network entertainment presidents that was sponsored by the Hollywood Radio and Television Society. And moderator *LA Times* columnist Brian Lowry noticed there was a decided lack of response from the network presidents about this issue, as if no one wanted to address it.

The answers are complicated. I believe one clue as to why this happened in the first place could be found in the pages of the *Hollywood Reporter* the day following the Emmys. That issue featured all of the coverage about who won, who lost, who cried, and who partied. Also included were four pages of all of the key head honchos in television arriving with their spouses and families. With the exception of NBC West Coast president Scott Sassa, who's Asian American, all of the executives pictured were white.

If there are no minorities in the powerful executive branch, minorities who can green light projects and have a real influence on what you see on the air, it might be hard to expect that there would be minorities on the shows. In order for there to be more multiculturalism on screen, there has to be significant and meaningful minority representation off screen.

That applies not only to executives but to the writing ranks too. Writers have to write what they know, and there are too few minorities on mainstream shows who are writing that can bring a whole new experience and perspective to the projects.

There's also an absence of consciousness based on this lack of representation. There should have been someone in the ivory towers of these networks who could have looked at their pilots or cast photos and said, 'Everyone seems to look kind of the same here, maybe we need to mix it up a bit. It would make sense, make the shows a little more attractive to all audiences.'

Thank goodness there are producers like David E. Kelley, Dick Wolf, Steven Bochco, and a few others who placed a true priority on showing an accurate picture on how America looks. That's because of who these producers associate with, who they work with, their interactions away from the world of entertainment, their sensibilities. It's not a forced portrayal, it's reality, and if you look at a show like *Law & Order* or *The Practice* or *Chicago Hope*, the roles played by Eriq La Salle, Gloria Reuben, Lisa Gay Hamilton, Steve Harris, these are not race-specific roles. They have nothing to do with their color. They're just people like you and

me with the same problems, the same joys, the same pains. More importantly, it's natural. It seems to make sense because it's not forced or mandated.

What's happening now, as I mentioned before, is that there is a scramble to increase the number of minority faces on the new shows, what many minorities in the entertainment industry have called sort of a "band-aid solution" to get the heat off. For instance, a few minutes ago I mentioned *Wasteland*, about the group of twenty-somethings in New York. After this controversy first broke, a black actor was quickly added to the cast, and in some of the new posters that you see around town -- bus benches and so forth -- it seems like he was almost digitally added in the background. You see a group of the white cast and then you see sort of this black face appearing above them. It's good for him. It's wonderful he has a job. But if a performer is being excluded because of their race, I find it ironic that they're being added because of their race.

So what's next? The head of the NAACP -- Kweisi Mfume -- recently met with the network heads, trying to repair the situation. He did not meet with the greatest reception, according to him, and he's planning to come back in a few weeks to talk with them again and see if there have been any significant changes. If not, he says, there's going to be a blackout. He's going to call for a viewer blackout and boycott against one or two networks. What effect this will have, whether this will really make an impact on the network executives, whether they will even care, remains unclear. But it's clear also that in order for there to be any real significant change, the heat has to stay on the network executives and the discomfort level must be maintained.

There's also a lot of heat now about an upcoming show on CBS that's being produced by Steven Bochco that's taking place in an inner-city hospital, and I think there's a lot of weight that's going to be put on this show. If this show fails, I think the executives might have some reason to point at this show and say, 'See, we tried to have an all-black drama and it didn't work,' which entirely misses the point. And I think a lot of the executives also see this issue as being a black and white issue, which further excuses them from trying to do anything, when it involves all minorities. It involves Latinos, Asians, Native Americans, everybody.

And the final thing is, as far as what's next, is that the *LA Times* is going to continue to cover this, and when it comes to this issue, we definitely can't get enough of it either.

So I thank you.

LT. GOVERNOR BUSTAMANTE: Thank you.

In a delicious twist of irony, all of us in the public view and in public office, or in the public, have some role that is often interviewed and questioned by the press. If there are any questions by any of the members of the Commission to the reporter, to ask about either the content of the report or the meaning of it, please, now is the time to ask.

Yes sir.

MR. MORRIS KIGHT: Thank you very much, sir.

Something has been done about it over the years. We've advocated inclusion and at some time or another was some minor effort for inclusion. All that seems to have been voted down. All that seems to have been repealed. Isn't somebody, somewhere, responsible for getting us back on track? An inclusive society is a better society, is a more just society, and besides, it's just common decency to employ a variety of people.

They hit us with quota. Good grief, it's just a racist ploy to use quota to make us lose our courage.

What to do, sir?

MR. BRAXTON: It's a good question. I think that there is a fear among executives or producers or writers about the accuracy of minority portrayals. Since there may not be many minorities that they know or come into contact with, they feel fearful that if they put more minorities on the screen that the portrayals might be attacked.

There was an example, a very controversial example last year, where David E. Kelley in *Ally McBeal* tried to put on an interracial relationship between the title character and a very handsome doctor that she met and fell in love with, and he specifically geared that story line to not be race-specific. The race of this couple didn't have any impact on their relationship, even though it was taking place in Boston, probably one of the least conscious -- well, you know what I'm saying. And he got flack for that, and I think a lot of producers and executives feel it's sort of a damned if you do, damned if you don't situation, so it's better if we don't. And periodically these flare-ups and controversies may come up but they'll eventually go away.

And so I don't think that anything, as far as someone putting us back on the right track, I think the importance of the issue has to be maintained, whether it's from the NAACP, whether it's from people within the industry who keep pointing out that it really doesn't make sense, I think, to a lot of these executives. Their priorities are in what's going to work, what's going to

make the best show, what's going to be the best formula? And somehow, placing diversity within that formula kind of muddles up the waters. It's kind of, 'We'll worry about that later; first of all, we need to get a hit. We need to get something that's going to work in this time slot. We need to get something that's going to lead into *ER* and keep those people and their butts in their chairs in the living room.'

So I think it's going to be a long process before we get back on the right track and that in the ivory towers, there's maybe going to have to be someone who's a little more sensitive to the issue at hand. How soon it will take for that to happen is really unclear.

Any other questions?

DR. STARR: Sir, I don't understand how we could go from success to failure without any description, in your discussion at least, to the process in between. *NYPD* is an incredible show. It has the self-confidence even of having the one detective, the white detective, get into a fistfight with his black boss. It was a very dramatic scene, each of them, out of a question of whether somebody was playing an investigation favorable or unfavorable on the basis of race. It was incredibly honest, powerful television.

How can we go from that success, and the program has done well, and have all that repudiated? I don't see the connecting link in the process, why the repudiation.

MR. BRAXTON: It's curious. There's one producer, John Wells, who is one of the executive producers of *ER*, which has been continually applauded for its multiculturalism, and John is behind one of the new shows this season -- *West Wing*, which I talked about earlier about the White House -- in which there are no minorities, at least in the first couple of episodes. I think this is one of the shows where you're going to start seeing faces pop up in the next few weeks or so especially. And I asked John and also Scott Sassa, the head of NBC, how something like this could happen. How you could have this great example of multiculturalism on one hand and yet the extreme on the other. And both of them said, 'We really are unhappy about this situation. We tried, but we were looking for the best actors for the role. That was our main priority -- who would fit, who had chemistry and who didn't -- and when we wound up with the best mix, we found out that there weren't any minorities in the pictures.'

I think that's an example of how diversity is not an ongoing priority and that's why you see these extremes. *NYPD Blue* and *ER* are perfect examples of how multiculturalism could work. And why the producers of these shows don't see that example, take the ball and run to it

and run with it, is still a mystery. I think you'd have to talk to the individual producers to see why, but they say they try. How hard that effort is, is up in the air.

DR. MARVALENE HUGHES: I'm Marvalene Hughes, and my trade is education, so I'm in the business of trying to provide education, especially postsecondary education and early outreach, where it's appropriate.

As I listened to you talk today, I could substitute every malady that you said and use the word "education." And I think perhaps all of us who are here could do the same thing. Whatever we represent by our trade, we find the same dynamic. And so I put that in terms of really looking at the symptoms as opposed to getting to the heart of the matter and looking at the problems.

And I guess more than anything else, I just want to caution us, as we move through all of this, to be aware that this dynamic is a dynamic that applies to every profession, to every walk of life that we are in, and if we are going to really make a difference as a commission and as media, we have to concern ourselves with getting to the problem, the heart of the problem.

HON. CRUZ REYNOSO: The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights has subpoena authority, so the major officials in the industry were subpoenaed to the 1993 hearings, at which time they spoke of the progress that had been done and promised to double their efforts at diversity. I'm sure they meant it at that time, but then, as you indicate, somehow the effort was made for a while and then it disappeared.

I guess the question has to be asked in terms of what can be done to have that effort be consistent, and I guess it's really asking the same question as before, with the interest to go up and down.

MR. BRAXTON: Well, I can almost guarantee you that none of the people that you subpoenaed back in 1993 are around now. They've been long gone. They're ancient history.

MR. JESUS TREVIÑO: I'd just like to comment on what the doctor mentioned. I think there is a difference in the motion picture industry. Over the past twenty years, if you look at the demographics, writing in Hollywood by Latinos has gone from one-half a percent of all writers of _____ being written by Latinos from the 1980s to the 1990s to one percent in the current decade. In directing, it's gone from one percent of the directing done in motion pictures and television by Latinos in the '80s to now in the '90s it's one-and-a-half to two percent. The acting, we all know, is anywhere from three-and-a-half to four percent.

So if you look back over the past twenty years, you have these dismal statistics of our presence, and the difference between the motion picture industry and education, the fire department, the LAPD, any other civic organization, is imagine a city that is 44 percent Latino and the fire department has one percent or half a percent Latino. That would never be tolerated. Imagine education. Imagine one percent of the education of the teachers in Los Angeles being Latino in a city that's 44 percent Latino. That would never be tolerated. For the past twenty years it's "business as usual" in Hollywood. That's the difference. There's no one to police Hollywood.

MS. ZARA BUGGS TAYLOR: And I think...(hearing tape turned)...there's no particular prerequisite that you need to make it in Hollywood. The prerequisite is largely who we know. It's a very incestuous kind of business and it's based on relationships almost entirely.

I think in the final analysis talent is important, and writers' -- and I represent the Writers Guild -- whose careers last over long periods of time, are talented but very often they got there because they went to college with somebody, with the person who hired them, or they were married to that person, or they lived next door in the same neighborhood with that person. So it's very, very different than other kinds of hiring.

You have in front of you some packets from the Writers Guild. At your leisure, look through them, and if you'd like the full report, a very dismal report, we'd be happy to send it to you, our *1998 Hollywood Writers Report*.

We recently did a statistical analysis of this new television season.

LT. GOVERNOR BUSTAMANTE: We're going to have to come back to that.

MS. TAYLOR: Okay.

LT. GOVERNOR BUSTAMANTE: If you could hold that for when we come back to you directly. We're going to have to close out this segment with Mr. Braxton.

Can we have one last question please?

MR. JOHN MACK: It's been my experience over the years that frequently, whenever we engage in discussions around the media, and certainly with Greg -- I think we've had many over the years -- there are a couple of issues that emerge. One, of course, there's this umbrella of First Amendment rights and the importance of not stepping on -- you know, invading that precious sacrosanct arena. Secondly, creativity, the creative juices. I agree with the comment about the subjectivity involved and people not tampering with that.

And then we've gone through a period in which the FCC has pretty much deregulated itself out of the business of monitoring. One time we had such a thing as entertainment that's history and a few other things. I wonder if there are some opportunities here from a public policy point of view. Are there some areas in which maybe we could or should revisit FCC enforcement authority as a means of bringing some pressure? Or if there may not be some legislative opportunity here or regulatory opportunity to also try to get at this problem.

MR. BRAXTON: My gut reaction is that putting myself in the place of a white executive or a white writer or a producer, if someone came to me and told me I had an ensemble drama of six young people living in New York and I cast what I felt were the best people, people not only were great for the role but I felt comfortable with, and I were told by someone that, you know, 'You're going to have to get rid of two of these people and put a Latino in and an Asian in. That's just the way it's going to be or your show isn't going to get on the air,' I would have a great deal of problem with that.

MR. MACK: I wasn't suggesting quotas.

MR. RICHARD MASUR: The Supreme Court obviously would have a great deal of problem with that too.

If I could just suggest, there is a public policy element that could and should be addressed, and it has been dormant, and that is minority ownership of stations. What happened in the Telecommunications Act, the expansion of the ability to own radio and television stations by single companies and individual markets -- the FCC ruling recently to expand the number of stations that can be owned -- that is something which is pernicious and should be reversed. Because what we see this season is what happens when power concentrates into too few hands and too few minds, as it were.

I hope that one of the things that's going to come out of the energy that's in response to this season is that people will get together and organize and put tremendous pressure on the Congress, on the FCC, to reverse this process and to encourage minority ownership of stations, to change the FCC rules, so that only one station can be owned per market by any given company and to roll back this power grab that the big media companies are making.

LT. GOVERNOR BUSTAMANTE: Why don't we end this session here, and we'll have each of the panelists in this next section, we'll go through and have each of the panelists give us remarks.

In the meantime, Greg, thank you for your presentation. It was very, very interesting. I'm going to, at some point after this meeting, I'm going to ask you a different question. I'd like for you to think about it a little bit because I'd like to have an extended conversation about it.

What does it all matter? All that you've said, the entire description of what you described, and all the description that we're going to go through today, I'm going to want an extended conversation with you as how does it really make a difference by changing these different issues? I'm hoping that the other panelists will also talk about this as we get through this.

Thank you very much for coming.

With us today also, members of the Commission, is Richard Masur, President of the Screen Actors Guild; Lois Salisbury, President of Children Now; Jesus Treviño, a television director; Zara Buggs Taylor, Writers Guild of America; Jeff Valdez, a television producer; and Rick Mater with WB Television Network.

Thank you all for coming.

MR. MASUR: You skipped Anne-Marie.

LT. GOVERNOR BUSTAMANTE: I'm sorry, Anne-Marie Johnson. I apologize.

MS. ANNE-MARIE JOHNSON: That's all right. I never feel left out.

My...(inaudible).

LT. GOVERNOR BUSTAMANTE: You can't feel left out here.

MS. JOHNSON: Never.

LT. GOVERNOR BUSTAMANTE: So why don't we start with you, Richard. Why don't you give us an intro and--

MR. MASUR: I'll try and make it as brief as I can.

LT. GOVERNOR BUSTAMANTE: All right.

MR. MASUR: This season was one of the great opportunities that has ever presented itself, in my opinion. If you had written a script for the way to put this issue on the front burner, you couldn't have written it better. The fact that four networks, without collusion, mind you, because these guys are in competition with each other, independently came up with this asinine season is one of the great gifts ever handed to this Commission or anybody who's interested in diversity in the media. Because it's energized people, as I was saying before, and that was my comment before, I want to say for the record, in case it's being transcribed.

My concern is that we come at this from a public policy standpoint, thinking about fire departments and schools. This is not fire departments and schools, this is entertainment. And entertainment only has one purpose: to make money. What drives every decision that is made, every decision that is made in this industry, is not fairness, is not equity, is not anything but putting eyeballs in front of television screens in order to deliver them to advertisers.

LT. GOVERNOR BUSTAMANTE: So the criticism is unfair.

MR. MASUR: No, it's not unfair at all! No, the criticism is totally founded, well founded. What it is, is that the people making the decisions are ignorant and need to be educated, and let me explain what I mean very quickly.

There are markets out there which the networks are missing completely. In Screen Actors Guild, I'll tell you, some of the talk about the retreat from all the advances is not entirely accurate on the raw employment numbers. We do a thing called *The Casting Data Report*. Our employers report to us numbers of hires, different ethnic breakdowns, age, people with disabilities, etc. And the African-American community, both men and women, have continuously grown in their share of the work to the point where they are, under our contrast, are up to, in raw employment -- this is not quality of role, content of role, or size of role, mind you -- but in raw employment, the employment numbers are always in the area of between 11 to 13 percent, which is consistent with the proportion of the population. The Latino-Hispanic population, however, is the most completely out of whack of all, which is, as Jesus said earlier, is down around three, three-and-a-half percent.

Now, why this discontinuity? One reason is because, in the late '70s, an African-American buying market was identified because of Gordon Parks and some creative film makers who came out of the African-American community, were supported by the African-American community, and the studios and the networks noticed and they said, 'Whoa, there's money there and we're not getting it. Let's go get it, let's do some of those movies.' And they started doing the movies. Then Cosby had a hit and they said, 'Let's go get some more of that money.' And pretty soon what you see is the kind of employment levels we have for African Americans.

Plus, I want to also say, good, good politicking by the African-American community -- concise, thoughtful segments being put out there.

On the other hand, the Latino-Hispanic community is perceived by the industry -- and we did a study on this. It's called *The Thomas Rivera Report*. I hope you've seen it. It's very, very

informative. We would like to get it for the Commission, except we have to reprint it because we've distributed 3500 copies of this to producers, networks, and to this industry because they are so interested in what we came up with in this report. And what it basically says is contrary to what you think and the way you've programmed in the past, the Latino-Hispanic market is not monolithic and you can talk to them in English. Because what they've thought since time immemorial is the only way to contact that market, which they know is big and know has money, the only way to contact it is in Spanish.

So everything that they do is geared toward Spanish language, and consequently, there are no commercials with Latinos in them, except in Spanish, where there are lots of commercials with Latinos in them. There's lots of programming with Latinos in them in Spanish, but there are virtually no Latinos in mainstream programming.

What we demonstrated to them was that a proportion of the population, yes, only watches in Spanish, but a much larger proportion of the population either watches both in Spanish and English or only in English, and the ones who watch in Spanish and English are being driven into the Spanish-language market by the fact that they are never represented in mainstream television.

Well, we have delivered this, and just to let you know, not only has the response been tremendous from industry, but anecdotally, people that I know who have been trying to get meetings and sell projects that are Latino-themed projects for years are getting called by not one, not two, but three or four different networks: 'Can you come in and pitch this?'

So there is definitely a sea-change that's about to occur in that regard. But I just want to very quickly mention one other thing. Blackout, brownout, this can be impactful as can the lobbying done by the NAACP, but it's short-term results. They will react to it and they will make short-term changes, and then you'll lose their attention. The only thing they will ever react to on an ongoing basis is money, and the money comes from delivering eyeballs that advertisers want.

So what does that mean? What it means is, if they are programming to demographics, which are right between the ages of 16 and 28, and Latinos and African Americans and Asian Pacific Islanders, and Native American Indians turn off their television sets, well, they weren't expecting you to turn them on in the first place so they don't really care. You would have to have such massive numbers shutting off the sets for them to even notice.

On the other hand, if there is someone on a show like, for example, Andre Braugher on *Homicide: Life on the Streets* -- and that's only one example of a very powerful performance, a very powerful character that was textured, enriched of an African-American man -- if they had gotten 300 letters saying, 'I'm an African American, I watch this show primarily because Andre Braugher is on it. Not only do I watch this show because of this portrayal, but I buy the products that are advertised,' and you let the advertisers know it, you let the sponsors know it, and you let the producers and the networks know it, 300 letters like that suddenly draw their attention to the fact that they are attracting an audience that they weren't anticipating, and then they start thinking about that audience and they try to sell that audience and deliver it to the advertisers. And that's how real change happens is by dealing with them on their own terms, which is 'How can we deliver eyeballs to our advertisers?'

LT. GOVERNOR BUSTAMANTE: Thank you.

Lois, there's been a lot of description going on. How does it affect the kids? And why should any of this make any difference? For those of us who are very concerned not only about issues of diversity but tolerance issues -- we know children are not born to hate, they learn to hate -- how does it affect the kids?

MS. LOIS SALISBURY: It has a very profound effect on all children, whatever their ethnic background.

A year ago, Children Now conducted an in-depth poll -- I hope that we've provided it to you -- if mechanisms and the logistics didn't work, we'll certainly fix that, but we tried to provide it to each of you today -- that really asked a set of questions of America's youth -- it was a representative poll -- that had never been asked before regarding what they saw and what kind of impact it did have on them. And it was a very diverse poll where we really got into depth, particularly with the major ethnic groups, to make sure that we really had representative views. The kids were from 10 to 17.

The most stunning result of that poll was how clearly and how powerfully and how early all of the children in America see the inequities that the media is perpetuating. How clearly they saw that it was important for themselves and people of all races to be reflected in the media, and how much they appreciated the power of television to provide both role models and, unfortunately, to perpetuate stereotypes. So that in terms of identity and a sense of inclusion and

a sense of tolerance, kids got it right away. And it does affect them both in terms of their relationships and their expectations for themselves and for one another.

I know time is short. I could give a few highlights but I also want to be respectful of the rest of the panel, so whatever your pleasure is.

LT. GOVERNOR BUSTAMANTE: Gives us some examples, give us some highlights.

MS. SALISBURY: The kids were very clear about what effect it would have on them and very clear about the unfairness, for example. They all said there simply are not enough Latinos and Asians on television, and that the absence, the dearth of Latinos and Asians, had a profound effect on all children.

LT. GOVERNOR BUSTAMANTE: How does it affect their behavior? How does it affect what they do and what they decide that would be good or bad? To join gangs or not join gangs? To hate or not to hate? How does it affect?

MS. SALISBURY: I think it affects both the aspirations of the kids who are either invisible or will only see very limited roles perpetuated on television, and there was much of that in our study.

So, for example, one Asian girl said, 'When you watch TV, you want to think I could do that, I could be there. That could be me in five or six years. But you don't see anything of yourself and you're just like, oh well, maybe I'll just have to do this instead,' so that it's a very limiting kind of effect and impact on kids' aspirations. But it's also one that kids across races saw of one another. They copped to the fact that if television perpetuates -- and it does in our study -- that, for example, that it's much more likely to see African Americans cast in negative roles and much more likely to see whites cast in positive roles, that that has an impact on their perceptions and their interactions. And they also believe it has an impact on how people perceive them. Many of the kids in our focus groups talked about how adults reacted to them and they couldn't understand why they reacted to them that way except for they must be getting it from television. So kids were profoundly aware of its limiting as well as its empowering consequences on who we are as a people.

To be hopeful for a minute, and to talk very much about the bottom line, which I think is really the fundamental issue that we all have to grapple with, including many of us civil rights veterans in this room who know that we've sort of run up against the limits of our capacity to necessarily achieve this with compulsion or coercion, there is some hope about this younger

generation. The researchers -- and we've had them testify from MTV at our conferences on several occasions -- tell us that this younger generation expects diversity. That's the reflection they want. That's who they see themselves being. Three quarters of the kids we polled said that they had a best friend of another race. This is a nationally representative poll. Obviously, that is a different experience of diversity than the adults who preceded them.

The rush today for adolescent programming, which is also a new way that we're seeing in this season, I think could be the opening of an opportunity. I don't see the programming playing out that way, but if those programmers want to succeed because they've suddenly decided the youth market is hot -- all of the advertisements Mr. Braxton was citing -- that advertiser knows that those kids that they want to attract to buy their product want to see an inclusive picture. We'll see whether the entertainment programmers get the same idea. But if the youth market is so hot and so full of rich prospect, it's rich across the lines.

LT. GOVERNOR BUSTAMANTE: Thank you.

Jesus, you're a producer and a director. You've got to meet a bottom line: You've got to make money. You're in business to make money. It's show business. There's only one Bill Cosby, so what do you do?

MR. TREVIÑO: Well, I think a number of Latinos have taken the lead in going for the gold in the barrio in terms of our specific Latino market. They know that our audience is there, and while the majority entertainment industry hasn't yet discovered the fact that Latinos are soon to be the largest minority in the United States and that there is potentially the same market value there that they have found in previous decades in the African-American community, certainly many people in our ranks have discovered that and are going to be lucrative and make money off of it.

It's certainly the case that years ago that you'd hear that there are no qualified. Well, I just came off of a two hour movie for Showtime that I directed that had a totally integrated cast, largely Latino. My DP was Latino. My AD, 2nd AD, 3rd AD, and all the PA's were Latinos. My soundman was Asian American. The wardrobe costume designer was Latina.

We're here.

In answer to your question you asked about the impact, I think that there's a prevalent stereotype about us. Hollywood has for years thought of minorities or race in a bifurcated manner. In Hollywood, race is about being black or white, and I think this is a legacy of the '60s

and probably the Civil War. But certainly in a pluralistic America that we live in today, it is a dysfunctional approach. And certainly in a state like California, where we have a pluralistic community, it's much more intelligent to think of the other minorities -- the Latinos, the Asian Americans, the Native Americans and other groups -- that have traditionally been excluded.

And I often run into this in the industry. As a producer, I remember going to one producer who was complimenting me and complimenting Greg Nava and complimenting Luis Valdez because it was great to see these people from Mexico making such strides in American television. And I had to remind him that there's a gravestone outside of McAllen, Texas with the name Treviño on it, just like this, and the date on it is 1701. My people have been here before there was a United States. And yet, in the industry -- I'll reiterate those dismal statistics: Only one percent to two percent of the directing done in Hollywood is done by Latinos. One percent of the writing, three-and-a-half percent of the acting.

So these are the things. I don't think that it's about coercion in terms of bringing about change. I think it is about education, and it's about education with not the stick but with the carrot, and the carrot is the one that Richard has identified. It's a money-intensive industry and we certainly have the carrot. We have a market out there that we need to promulgate and educate and say, 'Folks, there's gold in the barrio.'

LT. GOVERNOR BUSTAMANTE: Thank you.

Zara? It's been a long time since your grandmother played Mother Jefferson. Industry has changed a bit. Tell us how.

MS. TAYLOR: Well, I'm not sure that it has, and this is why. We recently did a statistical analysis at the Writers Guild and we compared dramatic shows and comedies. We found that on dramas there was representation across the board, at least with respect to African Americans, in front of the camera and also somewhat behind the camera. But if you look at writers across the board, you will find, even on shows like *NYPD Blue*, an absence of them. It wasn't until a huge controversy involving David Milch that the first black writer, David Mills, was put on staff about three years ago.

We looked at African-American sitcoms and we looked at white sitcoms. We found zero writers of color. Zero on any sitcom with predominately white cast. And this goes for the new season as well as returning shows. Absolutely none.

In the new season, of the 285 writers hired on those shows, one is Latino, 4 are Asian, 17 are African American, and there are no American Indians writing on the new season. Of the African Americans, half of the writers in the new season are writing on one show. It's called *The Parkers*, which is a black show. It was well known in the industry that black writers could only find employment on that show. And as for Asians and Latinos, because there are no Asian or Latino shows, there is an absolute absence of them behind the scenes.

So one of the things that I think a lot of publicity has failed to focus on is behind the camera: Who is doing the writing, who is doing the hiring? So that information is coming out slowly but surely and we hope to see a more concentration on those figures.

It's interesting that in an industry -- you know, when I go out and talk with executive producers and others at the studios, I hear the same story: 'Well, it's color blind. We just hire who's best for the job.' But it's very interesting, when you look at the industry, how color conscious many of the employment decisions seem to be. For instance -- and while I applaud WB and UPN for their focus on African Americans, and that is, of course, a marketing decision and a smart one -- I am concerned nevertheless with what I perceive, and the Guild perceives to some extent, to be a balkanization so that you have sort of a ghetto-ization of black writers and other writers of color on to UPN, WB and the BET, Univision, and Telemundo. And you have in mainstream or network television, you have got white writers, largely white male writers, under the age of 35 writing, directing, and employing folks on those shows. So that's what the industry looks like on the television side.

On the feature side, on the film side, we have found that there is increasing opportunity, at least in the area of independent film making, for women and minorities. It's a very interesting phenomena. I think that's why the guilds all together are becoming more involved in festivals. We are looking for those new writers, those new directors, those new performers. And we are also focused at our Guild on trying to make this industry do a better job. So we're involved in a couple of initiatives that I'd like to tell you about.

Well, I should back up a little to tell you that I'm also co-president of the Media Image Coalition, and one of the things that we believe is that the media both reflects and shapes attitudes and perceptions. The Human Relations Commission, and Morris Kight is with the Human Relations Commission, has sponsored this project since 1990, and we have discovered that there is a nexus, for instance, between hate crime and media images. There was also a

nexus, we believe, between the defeat of 209 and media images. If you noticed during that time, a lot of shows, including dramatic shows, depicted the whole issue of Affirmative Action very negatively, and they constantly referred to quotas and preferences, even on *NYPD Blue*.

So there is a nexus between attitudes, perceptions, even our political decisions, and what we see in television and film.

Now back to film. In film, and this is perhaps a little known fact, almost 30 percent of all tickets to all movies are purchased by blacks and Latinos together. That is enormous power. Whereas in television they may not care what we watch, they certainly do in film.

I happen to believe that we do have to use a bit of coercion along with education. I'm a little tired of educating because they know what the problem is, they've had these reports. We've been doing them for ten years. I think that it's time for a little bit of coercion. I think it's time for us to go out and call them on it.

One of the things that we're doing at the Guild is working with the Department of Labor. You'll learn more about that on March 22nd. The Guild is having an event and I invite you all to it.

But my response also to John is that you're right. You know, we constantly hear this cry about First Amendment rights. And our view is that you really don't have true freedom of expression until all points of view are included, until all of our stories are told.

LT. GOVERNOR BUSTAMANTE: Thank you.

Jeff, a lot of people believe that the radical ethnic agenda is an American agenda; it's just about good schools, good jobs, safe neighborhoods, and an opportunity to use all your God-given talents. Why haven't we broken out of mainstream?

MR. JEFF VALDEZ: Andre Aggasi hit it on the head when he said, "Image is everything." I mean, last year in network news there were 12,000 news stories done. Of those 12,000, 120 were about Latinos; 14 were positive. So one-tenth of one percent of the images that people see on us are negative images. So that's one of the reasons. I mean, there's story after story of perception, and it's not just English network news, it's also in Spanish media. Spanish media managed to convince people that, yeah, again, we only speak Spanish. The reality of the marketplace, the Latino marketplace, is 25 percent are Spanish dominant, 25 percent are English dominant, and 50 percent are bilingual. And so for years we've been told in the media 75 percent only speak Spanish, and advertising and everything goes that way.

But now, a company like ours, if I may, CTV is launching a channel aimed at multiculturalism. People are saying, 'It's a Latino channel, it's Latino.' It's really not. I mean, our goal is this channel really be viewed as multicultural.

Lois was talking about what kids were saying. We hire Frank Megan Associates, and they research all the different channels and they have been for years. The one thing we found through our research across the board, 18 through 34, Anglo, black, Latino, was the number one word: multiculturalism.

So my first question is, you know, where are the networks? Who's doing their research for them? They are getting screwed. I'm sorry if they're paying money for -- this research is saying '*program white; program white.*'

And the other thing is, Anglo Americans don't just want to see themselves on TV. When I first came to L.A., I was a standup comic. I tried to come here and be a comic and I was told, "Well, we can't put you on TV because you talk about being Latino," and I said, "Well, that's unusual because I just got back from Iowa and got a standing ovation there. They didn't seem to have a problem with it."

You know, people want to know what they don't know. So when we talk about the need for diversity and the need for creating new images, that it's so critical. And not just in drama, because when you look at drama, you know, I tip my hat to a lot of the producers, but again, we have senses of humor. We have some terrific senses of humor. There's a guy named Ricky -- Desi Arnaz -- a character named Ricky, a long time ago. People say, 'Well, when you have the next Cosby, that's going to be the next breakthrough.' We had that, and it was called the Lucy show and nothing happened since that.

When we talk about movies, we buy a third of the movie tickets. Insects had more movies than Latinos did last year. You know, this is reality. This is totally very real. We talk about colorblind casting.

LT. GOVERNOR BUSTAMANTE: I'd never thought of it that way.

MR. VALDEZ: They really did. And then, of course, some studio exec will say, 'Well, yeah, but Jennifer Lopez was one of the ants.' Yeah, but there were a million other ants that weren't Latinos, so I'll counter that.

Colorblind casting, we say, 'Well, the opportunities are there for other actors.' That's not true. There's a thing called a breakdown that goes out. In the breakdown -- I'll give you an

example. We just shot a new pilot, CTV did, for Nickelodeon. We're co-venturing with Nickelodeon. And it was the most wonderful experience. We focus on the negative and I'm going to focus on the positive for a moment. I had the pleasure of writing and exec producing it. Our director was Latino. Our executive in charge of production was Latino on the network level, which is a rarity. And it was great because his notes weren't stupid. I've dealt on the other side where I've had some really just questionable notes. And our cast were Latino. But guess what? The script, you could have changed the name to any American name and that script would have worked. So this big mystery of, you know, 'How do we get Latinos on TV or blacks on TV?' Cast them. It's that simple. Cast them.

But what happens is you get in the writers' room, you have people in the room, and a person of color walks in and they immediately put a giant spotlight and say, well, he's black, he's got to walk in and say, 'Whatup, whatup?' And the Latino has to walk in and go, 'Horalé vato?' Again, they're affected by these images they see. So it all starts at the writing. It starts at a level called the show runner.

There's a very powerful person in town called a show runner, and a show runner, basically it's a writer with a lot of power. Originally you had a head writer and you had a producer that produced shows, and now they just kind of merge the two into it, a title called show runner, and there's a very limited number of show runners. So much so that this year Bob Wright of NBC, when asked why there are not more comedies on NBC, he commented, he said, 'Well, there's not enough writers out there,' which really -- I'm sure you'll find amazing, when you heard that comment. I mean, there are so many writers out there. There are not many show runners but there are a lot of writers.

So possibly going back to the old system, where you can take some established producers and marry them with runners, with writers, that can write and help bring them into the system. That's important.

On our Nick show, I hired a line producer that was not Latina, and when she came in and she started bringing in all of the middle-of-the-line people, first thing, I started looking at all the resumes. I said, "There's no diversity in this crew." I said, "Please diversify this crew." And she said, "Well, but I don't have time." I said, "You have to make time, if you have to work a little extra harder," and she did. And at the end of the day, we had a very diverse crew, and

people came up to me throughout the process and said, 'This is the most diverse crew I've worked on. This is wonderful.'

I don't just associate with Latinos. You don't just associate with blacks. I mean, we're Americans. We associate with each other. And in order to be perceived, we need to be perceived again just as Americans.

And to address Mr. Mack's comment about public policy, there are solutions. One of the things is the FCC on satellite carriage -- Echo Star, Direct TV. The FCC regulates the DBS systems. They are totally regulated by the FCC, and when they start talking about their carriage of networks, cable, and broadcasts, the FCC can absolutely affect that. The AT&T/Media One mergers, they're having to go through local and regional councils and politicians in order to get these mergers passed. You can absolutely file concerns about diversity. The Viacom-CBS deal, there's an opportunity there to file a need for diversity.

With vertical integration with these giant media companies, it's making it a really scary future. At one time there were thirty MSOs -- multi-system operators, cable operators. Now there are four. So in a case like CTV, we go out and we strike out with one, it's going to be a hard row to toe, but fortunately we're in real good shape. We've got banks attached. We're getting all the needed things to create a channel that will create diversity.

And finally, an opportunity for public policy is studios and networks need roads, they need tax breaks. They need a lot of things that the city and state provide them. You can absolutely affect their bottom line when they come to you next time and ask you for ingress, egress, and various things that they need to make their studios and to run their business.

LT. GOVERNOR BUSTAMANTE: Thank you, Jeff. That was informative.

Anne Marie...(hearing tape turned)...young women of color have very, very few things to look at in terms of the little screen or the big screen and see themselves there.

MS. JOHNSON: Well, I'm in a very unique and frightening position. To speak out -- and I just call it what it is: It's pure racism to me. Economics is a nice word, but I think what we're dealing with is just systematic, systemic, and accepted racism, and that's why we have a white-white season.

But I'm caught in a very tenuous position because, as an actor, I'm one of the only actors of color who speak out on a regular basis, and I'm easily becoming blacklisted within the industry, because no one wants to expose "the emperor has no clothes."

On the topic of show runners, I recommend if everyone is truly interested in why this industry looks the way it is, I recommend that you read a book called *The Show Runner*, written by David Wild, and it gives you the ins and outs of show runners, who they are, why they are, and how unqualified they are.

Fortunately through the Screen Actors Guild, I've been able to satisfy much of my frustration. We were talking about reports. Myself, and through the Affirmative Action Department, with the support of President Masur and the senior staff, along with Dr. Darnell Hunt, we've been commissioned to do a report called *The African-American Television Report*, the first of its kind. And what we will do, we will videotape over 700 hours of prime time television from the six networks, edit it down to 10 minutes, go to each network head and show them missed opportunities for diversity. It's a form of education but it's also a form of holding one's hand and showing them where they went wrong, and I think this is going to be one of the viable tools that can be used by every, I use the word, endangered group, which people of color are in the industry.

When we're talking about lack of opportunities for performers of color, and Greg mentioned a couple of the shows, I'm one of the only people on the panel who actually has been told I'm not going to be cast because I'm black. I had opportunities to audition and test for many of the shows on the '99-2000 season, and I was told I was overqualified, which is a code word for "we're not going that way." I find it hard to believe with the dearth of untalented people in this business one can be considered overqualified.

It's America's dirty little secret, and I believe that the industry is twenty years behind the American scene. We discussed the fire department, the police department, other government agencies. Television does not reflect what's really going on in America. It doesn't reflect it honestly, and I think it's the last hold of socialized races than we have in America.

Television is extremely powerful, and when you portray images that suit a certain agenda, you are advocating something that one feels comfortable with. If people of color are perpetually portrayed as weak, dependent, not trustworthy, nasty, dirty, poor, uneducated, mean, violent, it keeps a certain sector in this country in a subservient position. To me, it harkens back to the old slave system. If you perpetuate that you can't read, you have no culture, you are not worthy, you have no place. It keeps a certain sector of this country in a position of not feeling comfortable with how we look, how we speak. We are told we have no culture, we are told we

are not articulate, we are told that we can't run for political office because we'll smoke cocaine and we'll be videotaped in a hotel room in Washington, D.C. We are told several things through the images of news. I think news is the most harmful media in regards to the images of minorities than any other form of entertainment, and I say, in this city, news is purely entertainment; we have no true news in this city.

So if we don't deal with the positive, proactive -- and I believe that executive producers and creators and show runners and writers have to be forced to diversify. Leave it up to many of the creative powers within this business, it will not happen until we have people of color and more women in decision-making positions in the Hollywood makeup. I think executive producers need to be forced to change their thought process. Several are without being forced. David Kelley is a perfect example. Dick Wolf is another example. Peter Ingalls of *Morning Television* is another perfect example. But not enough participate.

Greg Braxton brought up very powerful and money-making shows: *NYPD Blue*, *Ally McBeal*, all of the Dick Wolf production shows, all of the David E. Kelley shows. These shows are exceptionally successful. It entertains people of all cultures, of all faiths, and they're highly, highly successful in the syndication world which means they make a lot of money. Why other executives are not following suit, I can only go back to pure racism, because that's what it comes down to. It has nothing to do with economics. These shows are making money, so why is it that other networks are not following suit?

So my opinion is not a popular opinion, it's not very attractive, it's not very PC. It'll probably hurt me as an actress. But my dedication is for the American scene. I'm an African-American woman and that's my first priority, not my art.

LT. GOVERNOR BUSTAMANTE: Thank you.

Rick? Mr. Mater, you seem to be the one-eyed king in the valley of the blind.

MR. RICK MATER: I don't think I'd put it quite that way.

Well, thanks for that spirited presentation which puts me in an even more interesting position.

I'm Senior Vice President of Broadcast Standards for The WB Network. As such, I'm responsible for content in prime time. We also have the largest broadcast children's network, which, if any of you have children or grandchildren, you might be aware of it because of *Pokemon*, which is the current number one rated children's program.

After listening to everybody, I actually think the picture is a lot more mixed. There's success stories. There isn't any massive failure. Just to go with that anecdotally, last season on *Dawson's Creek*, there was a gay coming-out story, and with all deference to Richard Masur, this came about, by the way, because the executive producer was gay, which maybe tends to underscore the necessity of having people in those positions. This was actually a decision that hurt the network from a financial standpoint. The network did not try to kill the story. This got a lot of press. Unfortunately, from an advertiser's standpoint, overt gay characters are still considered something they want to stay away from -- in some cases, certain advertisers.

In fact, the gay example is maybe a really good example of a success story in the industry over the last fifteen years. If you go back fifteen years ago, there was literally not one gay character on television, on network television, openly gay character. Tony Randall had a show which basically got eventually cancelled -- I think it was by NBC -- where he was supposed to be a gay character and they changed it so that he wasn't.

There's over thirty gay characters on prime time network shows right now, everything from positive characters to negative. One thing that amount of characters gives you is an ability to creatively do more with the characters because you don't just have one gay character on a network in essence representing all gay characters. You can do a lot of interesting things.

But The WB actually came out pretty well in last week's advertising survey in terms of major recurring characters. Our figure, according to that study, for African-American major recurring characters was 23 percent. I think we can do better.

And I want to say one reason I'm probably the only person here is -- and Anne-Marie and I were talking about this ahead of time -- I think there's actually a lot of sympathy in the industry to the problem, but that makes for a discomfort in terms of confronting failures in that area, as opposed to an issue of debating television content where the industry may be opposed to the point of a certain advocacy group. Here, the industry is generally sympathetic and so are the executives I work with at The WB. And if we see a pilot that is all white, there are steps made to rectify that. And the fact that that happened at other networks. The example that Greg gave on *Wasteland*, I would turn that around. I'd say the fact that *Wasteland* is adding an African-American character is a success story. You know, if *Wasteland* stays on the air, a year from now no one's going to remember that that character was added two or three episodes in or after the

pilot. It's an African-American character in a prominent role on a show, and that's an example of lobbying efforts paying off.

In terms of things to do, I would encourage people approaching producers and studios directly. The beginning of the creative process, as alluded to the writers, it happens with studios, producers, casting directors. The network in some ways is at the other end of that process -- not to absolve us in any way. But certain groups, for example, the Media Project Advocating Sexual Responsibility. They've had tremendous success meeting with producers and getting producers to put, for example, safe sex messages in shows, and that is an approach that I think is pretty productive.

The FCC at the moment, which came up earlier, it's a little tricky because you have a deregulatory Republican Congress at the moment. You have an FCC that has basically a pro-regulatory commissioner in Kennard, but the other commissioners don't necessarily support that. So the FCC is in a very deregulatory mode. I think it makes as much sense to approach the trade community directly as a way of achieving things.

LT. GOVERNOR BUSTAMANTE: Good. So opened to questions of the Commission. I know that, Mr. Saito, you had your hand up before? Would you like to ask a question?

MR. LELAND SAITO: Mr. Masur, you had mentioned...(inaudible)...the bottom line?

MR. MASUR: I think we all have to be on the mike so that the tape will pick us up. I'm just trying to help.

MR. SAITO: You mentioned...(inaudible)...the bottom line, and so one of the things I was wondering about, especially with the comments Mr. Braxton made, is, on the one hand, we have commercials by companies like the Gap, and I don't mind mentioning this company's name, and I think it was actually a series. And one of the things that struck me, as far as I could tell, there were no Asian Americans in that ensemble cast.

So on the one hand, we have this lack of Asian Americans, but yet, when I turn on the local news, and as Ms. Johnson mentioned, another form of entertainment, we see a number of Asian-American women. And I think this is partly in response to viewer surveys which show that audiences feel that Asian-American women are attractive, they're trustworthy, they're honest, etc., etc. And we won't mention how they respond to Asian-American men. That's a whole different issue.

But my question is, why doesn't this transfer from the news to ads like the Gap or TV shows?

MR. MASUR: First of all, it's local programming versus national. That's a major thing. Making local sales when you know the demographic -- I mean, you see it. There are tons of Latinos all over the news, in Los Angeles, in New York, in Chicago. Wherever there are Latino populations, there are strong Latino representation on the news. In local programming, it's always much more responsive to the local demographic, I think is one reason.

The Asian community is a very interesting issue. I'm sorry I spoke so fast and so strongly before. I wanted to try and get a huge amount in, and I apologize for that. I was cognizant at the time. But one reason that it -- the African-American community, when they started making product and responding to and supporting the product, nobody was saying, 'Well, is that guy from New York or L.A.? Is that guy from here or there? Sidney Portier is from the island, should we support him?' There was none of that. It was like, you know, it's an African American, I'm interested in this.

The first big presence of Latinos after Desi Arnaz on television was Freddie Prinz, who got savaged, savaged, by the Mexican-American community in this country because he was Puerto Rican, and that was almost a death blow from the point of view of broadcasters. They went, 'Oh no, we're not walking into this again.'

The same thing almost happened, or started to happen around Lou Diamond Phillips in *La Bamba*. Though that film has been seen by something like 98 percent of all Latinos in this country -- now, there is a similar situation. I think people are starting to get past that now in the Latino-Hispanic community, but in the Asian-Pacific Islander community -- I always do all these hyphenates because I don't want to get in trouble, at the Guild at any rate -- in that community there is a similar kind of 'Are you Japanese? Are you Chinese? Are you Korean? Are you Filipino?' You know, there's a similar kind of -- like people being wary about that. And when you have that internal conflict and lack of cohesive identification, how do you get programmers, how do you get advertisers to identify you as monolithic enough to care about?

It's bizarre, but you talk about balkanization, and it's absolutely right. What we're looking for is exactly what has been achieved, as was stated earlier, on shows where they're presenting the full spectrum of the American scene, aside from old people and people with disabilities, but mostly the full spectrum of the American scene. That's what we're looking for.

But one way you achieve that is by creating, by identifying the market, letting them know that the market is there. And one way you do that is by culture-specific programming that works and sometimes crosses over, I think.

MR. SAITO: A universal thing?

MR. MASUR: Yeah, exactly. What we talked about on the phone, exactly.

LT. GOVERNOR BUSTAMANTE: Michelle, Randy, then Jill?

MS. MICHELLE PANNOR: I'm concerned with the idea that the media is so influenced by money and particularly because of its impact on young people. If we all can agree here today that the media shapes young people's perceptions about themselves and about society, that young kids can be influenced by what they see on TV in terms of what they decide to do with their lives and be influenced in terms of hate crimes, I'm wondering how can the media be encouraged to see themselves as influencers of children's ideas and be discouraged from viewing young people as consumers?

MR. MATER: Really, I don't think it's that clear cut. And we have a children's network, which, incidentally, we have a show in development called *Static*, which is an African-American superhero. It used to be on *DC Comics*. We have characters as a best friend in _____ and *Beyond*. Terry Powers, the lead character, is an African-American teenager.

I don't think it's quite as intentional as maybe Anne-Marie thinks. I think there may be a systemic problem but it's more of omission that people in executive positions at networks generally tend to be progressive and that it's a matter of reaching people.

And we do care about portrayals. And things have changed in twenty years. Not to go off in a tangent here, but one of the panelists mentioned *The Jeffersons* and nothing's changed. A big change is that the Jefferson's now -- if it's *The Steve Harvey Show*, if it's *Jamie Foxx*, if it's *For Your Love*, which is, by the way, two integrated sitcoms on the air which is on our network -- the creative auspices of those shows are African American, and the stars of those shows have a major say in the content, which is a big change from white producers, say, twenty years ago of *Good Times* and *The Jeffersons*.

But we really do care about the images or changes made. My department does this all the time, including negative stereotyping, particularly in children's programming but also in prime time. Those notes are given to producers or are changes made.

MR. VALDEZ: If I can comment real quick. First of all, I applaud that you're here. I would love to know where Mr. Sassa and Herzog and _____ and Bloomberg are at.

You made a comment that the network is at the other end of the process. As having just run my first show, there is an absolute opportunity for the networks to help make this change. Everybody keeps pointing fingers. I can tell you, in the pilot we just shot, when we decided on the cast -- as the producer I saw the cast that I wanted. I could not hire them until I had a network signoff, until we had a test deal in place. I don't do those deals, the network does that. And now that we're editing the show -- you know, I did my first pass of the show. Guess where that tape went to? Not to me. It went to the network, because it's a very simple concept. It's Business 101. They are the buyer, okay? They hold the checkbook. They have the right to tell me as the runner of this show how they want this show to go. Of course, I'm going to pitch certain things that I agree or disagree with, but again, networks are not at the other end of the process. They are the process.

MS. JOHNSON: If I could interject very quickly. If the networks own up to the power of image, that would mean the networks in the industry would have to own up with the violence in this country too. You can't take credit for one and ignore the other. So if a network says, 'Oh no, our images are helping shape positive images for young people in this country,' that means the industry has to take responsibility for the exorbitant amount of violence in this country with the same type of programming.

LT. GOVERNOR BUSTAMANTE: Maybe they're just saying they're giving us what people want in terms of programming.

MR. MATER: No, I certainly wouldn't say that. The violence issue is a completely separate issue. There is another side to the issue, and there's certainly handgun control, which has nothing to do with the networks but it's a tangent.

A quick thing, what Jeff said, the networks are certainly involved in the process, but who started the casting process on the show? It's the producers, it's the show runners, it's the writers and--

MR. VALDEZ: And again, the network. If Nickelodeon came to me and said, 'I want a guy from Madagascar as the father,' I'm going to find the guy from Madagascar as the father, I can guarantee you that.

MR. MATER: But, Jeff, if you had a show on the network that was a hit and they wanted another show from you, suddenly, you don't necessarily have to put the guy from Madagascar on.

MR. VALDEZ: That's not true. I have been with various established show runners and watched them get beat up in the room by network executives just as easily as the new guy. To be honest with you, I won't name the person, but I'll tell you, afterwards I was shocked at the influence the network had over this guy who has had two hit shows on the air, and they still had influence over him.

LT. GOVERNOR BUSTAMANTE: Lois.

MS. SALISBURY: Just a couple of quick points, that I hope will be on the radar screen of the Commission.

One is, by the way, that we talked about how diversity in the powers that be does make a difference. We have certainly found that as people become parents, that that has a strong element of interest. It raises their openness and their sensitivity to some of the impact of their own industry decisions. And to the degree that many of the decision-makers are not yet parents and are young and are still in upward mobility tracks where they haven't made time for a family, I think it's another element in this mix.

I do want the Commission to be aware that children's television probably has, I think we wouldn't dispute it, a brighter record on this score. But it is equally important for the Commission to be aware that most of the television that children watch is not children's television. It is prime time television. That's when those eyeballs are there. And one of the great challenges, I think, is to make sure that the fact that children are part of that audience, even if they are not the center of the target audience, still holds with it major responsibility.

The other point that I definitely want to bring out, and it's also in our poll and you can take a closer look at it, is the power of the news. Without doubt, America's youth are most hurt and most aware of the negativity in terms of diversity that is perpetuated by the news. And they feel it particularly when we talk about the inner section of race and youth where they understand that there's a double whammy, if you will, particularly youth of color, especially Latinos and African Americans are perpetuated in such negative frames, and it is a very profound impact that kids reported back to us on that.

Last thing, I do want to offer, at a future time of the Commission, that Children Now would be very pleased to put together for you a youth panel to talk with you about these issues. We have found that one of the most powerful messengers, including two of the studios themselves, which is another opportunity we can explore, is to actually have youth speak themselves. And we would be delighted to take up as many opportunities as we have to bring kids together because they really can be a much more powerful messenger than any of us.

LT. GOVERNOR BUSTAMANTE: Thank you so much. Randy?

MR. RANDY LOWE: Randy Lowe from Union Bank of California, which is a large corporation in this market, and we spend a tremendous amount of money on advertising. It's interesting to hear that you talk about it, that the bottom line is money.

We spend also a significant amount of time in the corporation ensuring that our advertising is socially responsible and socially conscious. What I'd like to hear from the panel, though, is what kind of influence could corporations that are socially responsible have on the programming itself? And you brought up the issue of the demographics and who watches, etc., and that's what you tell us as an advertiser, but how can we influence the other direction, ensuring that the audience is widened and that you really have a more diverse group in shows themselves?

MR. MASUR: Well, advertisers have been way, way ahead of programmers -- McDonalds, the banks specifically. And one reason is because it's enlightened self-interest. You guys are dealing with the full spectrum of society in trying to get them to come in. McDonalds knows people of color come into the store and they want them to. They want seniors to come. They want people with disabilities to come so they include them. Banks. Banks have been fabulous at doing the same thing.

I think, again, the one thing, if you look over your records, you're going to find where you've fallen down is in Latinos and Asians, that you've had a lot of African Americans on, but I will bet you anything you've had very few Latinos or Asians on your spots in English, at any rate. And I'm sure you do some Spanish language advertising as well.

Part of what's necessary is that the large corporations, being the sponsors who hire the advertisers, who are going to buy the time, need to transmit to the networks the fact that they're looking for a diverse set of eyeballs. They're not looking for monolithic.

LT. GOVERNOR BUSTAMANTE: How does he change your mind on programming?

MR. MATER: Well, actually, I agree with what Richard said, in terms of their own commercials and supporting shows that reflect a certain quality and diversity. It's actually a really tricky area because advertisers in the '50s had tremendous control over creative content through agencies producing shows, but there are a lot of negatives associated with that. Candidly, advertiser control of shows gets into issues of content, and they were very, very conservative back then. Talk about lack of diversity in shows, you know. You didn't have African Americans in shows in the 1950s.

But in terms of their own commercials and supporting, for example, African-American sitcoms in network television or a show like *For Your Love*, which is a diverse -- which is maybe what you were saying earlier--

MS. JOHNSON: It's probably a perfect example of programming, a sitcom _____.

MR. MATER: Right. Yeah, it's an integrated African-American/white cast.

MS. _____: All we need is an Hispanic family and a Native American family and it would be perfect.

MR. MATER: And it has an African-American show runner. And supporting a show like that or *The Hughleys* on ABC.

MR. VALDEZ: Well, the other thing, sir, is Proctor and Gamble -- I believe it's with Warner Brothers -- just recently gave WB Network a million dollars to develop family-oriented scripts. If you were to get together with executives from other corporations to make those kind of requests, again, they're going to develop more scripts and with the specific mandate that they be written by people of color, because it's P&G's desire to -- you know, they know people of color are buying, all Americans are buying their product.

MR. BRAXTON: And it should also be pointed out that *For Your Love* was kicked off NBC. The WB picked it up but NBC didn't feel it fit on their schedule.

MS. JOHNSON: But they had solid ratings.

MS. JILL TREGOR: I'm Jill Tregor. I'm with Integrated Clearinghouse in San Francisco. We deal with hate motivated violence.

I have less a question and more a comment. And Mr. Mater, I don't mean -- you're a little too easy. I don't want to kind of too much focus on you as the only person who was brave enough to come today from a network, but I don't think that the analogy to what's happening with gay people on TV right now is actually really a good one.

First of all, it's thirty white kind of clever, witty, gay neighbors, male, all of them, no lesbians. So in that way I don't think that we're really seeing much diversity of my community. As a lesbian, I don't feel in any way reflected just in pure wittiness, for one.

But also, I think that having a breakthrough for representations of a different kind of white male is not really meaningful to me in the way it would be to see a spectrum of color even within the lesbian and gay community would be to me.

The other piece, though, that I want to say is really to look beyond the numbers, whether we are talking about lesbians and gays or any other community here, to say that we're more than neighbors and more than criminals. I just feel like we have to look, when we look at casting, at what roles we're casting, not just that we are casting. To me, too many of the shows, even some of the popular shows that have been discussed here as laudable shows, will have all the African Americans are judges. And actually, in real life, I've never seen that many African-American judges as I see on TV. It's become kind of one of the acceptable categories, just as an example.

So, to me, I think two pieces here. One is for those of you that are representing guilds. When you're doing your analysis, I think it would be helpful to sort of talk about what the roles are, but also for those of us that are in a position to change that, to try to be a little more creative about what roles are allowed for people that are other than white.

MR. MATER: Right. Actually, I think there's a little diversity in the gay characters. On *Felicity*, Javier, who's a good friend of hers, is a gay Latin character. We have a new show called *Popular*, which is our big push, high school show this fall. Someone mentioned disabilities. It has a blind principal, it has an Asian teacher, it has a black gay drama teacher, it has a, I'll say, presumably lesbian science teacher, because it's there but it hasn't been identified in dialogue from her at this point, and I'm not sure what they're going to do with it.

Your point is well taken, but I do think with the increase in gay characters, you actually are seeing more diversity of characters. But you're right, they are predominately white male, and I think it's something that could be improved.

LT. GOVERNOR BUSTAMANTE: Before you start, if there's anybody in the audience that would like to have a question asked, you can get your question put on the cards by Amelia Lyons. She'll pass them around if anybody would like to ask a question.

Maha, please.

MS. MAHA ELGENAIDI: Thank you. My name Maha ElGenaidi and I'm the representative of Islamic Summit Networks Group. We provide educational seminars relating to Islam and the Muslim world to public institutions. We work with the media. We work primarily with schools and certainly with law enforcement as well.

Everything I've heard here today can be certainly applied to the Arab-Muslim community, which is generally vilified certainly by Hollywood and the media. And according to an expert, Dr. Jack Shaheen, who wrote this work right here -- which actually is a gift for Mr. Bustamante -- which is called *The Arab and Muslim Stereotyping in American Popular Culture*, which is a prelude to a more scholarly work, according to his study, about 15 to 20 television telecasts per week denigrate or mock Arab Americans, and we all know what those images are, of course.

Zara Taylor mentioned that there's a nexus between media images and hate crimes, and I wanted to share with you the statistics following the Oklahoma bombing where the media immediately suspected that Arabs were the culprits behind that bombing. We experienced about 222 hate incidences just in the first 36 hours. So definitely that's there. And images presented in the media are only compounded by characterizations of Arabs and Muslims in Hollywood. At the extreme end they're terrorists. Of course, they're always the bad guys. And at the other end they're usually gas attendants with an accent. I have a friend of mine who just became an actor and that was the role that he was cast in.

I'm actually very interested in Jeff's station, or channel -- Sí TV -- and I was interested in knowing what the percentage of the audience was for ethnic media. Is that a good way to characterize Sí TV? Would it be considered an ethnic channel or ethnic media?

MR. VALDEZ: Well, it's more -- I mean, there's a definite Latino base there, but one of the things that was really interesting, when we did the focus groups, it was a weighted survey, so Latinos only comprised, obviously, approximately 11 percent of the survey. But when we did focus on the Latinos, we asked them, 'This will be more or less your channel, what would you like it to look like?' You know, I'm thinking here all these years of exclusion and the one comment is, 'We want to see everybody on our channel.'

When Giselle Fernandez, who hosts the talk show -- yes, she is Latina and she hosts the show, but we want her to not just interview Selma Hayek and Jennifer Lopez. We want to see Brad Pitt, we want to see Oprah, we want to see everyone.

And so the one thing that really opened our eyes up on the channel was, yes, it is based on a Latino perspective but it is very needed to be multicultural. And one of the things when we presented it that way for the quantitative research, the number one response, the 18 through 34 Americans came back and said was, 'We like this channel because it's unique and different.' When you can get that kind of response -- 71 percent said 'unique and different' in this era of channel clutter -- that's telling you somebody's missing the boat out there. You know, obviously we're going to run after that opportunity. And I've told people, we're really kind of just trying to look like what we think TV should look like.

MS. TAYLOR: I'm glad you mentioned Jack Shaheen. Jack did a couple of panels actually for us on the Media Image Coalition, and you probably know that the American Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee, which also belongs to MIC, is doing a pretty good job. They have made and built relationships with executives over at Disney, for instance, so that they're able to go in and access them and talk with them about what's wrong and what's right.

MS. ELGENAIDI: But a lot of good that's done with Disney.

MS. TAYLOR: It's beginning to make an impact, but as I say to everyone, this is a very, very difficult process. It's a war of attrition and you win one little battle at a time. But I would just say that that is a group I think that's beginning to make some inroads and provide some really good models for us.

LT. GOVERNOR BUSTAMANTE: Thank you. Janice?

DR. JANICE EMERZIAN: Thank you. We like to claim Lieutenant Governor Bustamante because he's from the Valley. It's so good to be here. The real Valley, San Joaquin Valley.

My name is Janice Emerzian, and I'm an administrator at a San Joaquin Valley college, and my primary interest in this Commission is regarding disability issues. I've been the director of a major disability related program and serve on many different commissions that involve disability.

But I have two points I want to make. One is a point and the other is a question. I want to go back to something Dr. Hughes said earlier. Education -- and I'm not going to make my point simply that education in itself is the answer -- but the educational environment is really part of the answer. We have, in any college I've been on, on any campus not only in California but throughout the states, constantly have corporations, individuals, out recruiting individuals of

color for technology, for sciences, for many other disciplinary areas. However, I cannot recall a time when I've ever seen anyone recruiting any of our students of color for the media. And I'm talking about the theater, I'm talking about television, movies, as well as the printed media. And that came to mind as I was listening to some of the wonderful comments that you were saying that I was recording.

And my other question that I'd like to ask you is I heard a couple of times the issue of disability _____, and obviously, it's a very passionate issue with me. Disabled students very, very rarely are ever, ever encouraged to think about media as an option. A lot of the printed media that have recently included individuals with disabilities really have done it forcibly and we've worked very hard on that in terms of many different groups. So you'll see a person in a wheelchair once in a while in some of the printed media and you're seeing more deaf individuals in movies and television, etc., but it's not a real consistent activity. And I'm just wondering if you've incorporated that in terms of your issues as well.

MS. TAYLOR: Absolutely. Actually, I'm working with the President's Committee on Employment of People With Disabilities. One of the things that we've done at the Guild is to put together seminars for writers to expose them to issues relative to people with disabilities. We work pretty closely with Gail Liamson over at Media Access, and she's also a member of MIC.

So yeah, that's very important. And of course, you know, the Deaf Entertainment Foundation, or Guild, has a really good directory of actors and writers with disabilities, and they're having some luck in getting that distributed throughout the industry. So there's a little movement but it's very, very difficult and very slow.

We do need more shows like *ER* where John Wells has gone out of his way to put characters in the script who just happen to have a disability but the story doesn't revolve around their disability. So we're trying to educate writers about that as well.

MR. MASUR: And the Screen Actors Guild, for us this has been an issue for many years. We have been, I will freely admit, extremely ineffective in accomplishing much along these lines. Where you are starting to see, and have for the last few years, more and more people with disabilities show up in programming. As I said, they're fairly present in advertising but in programming is in the background. So you don't see them so much playing the principal roles, the speaking roles, but where you do see them, you'll see them moving through the background much more than you used to. And that's because there is a growing awareness in the industry

that this is part of the spectrum that has to be represented in order to come out with a complete picture.

Unfortunately, as I've said before, the two most horribly underrepresented groups in the media are people with disabilities and seniors. On television, seniors are virtually absent, and relative to their numbers and their buying power, it's unbelievable how absent they are. And people with disabilities relative to their numbers certainly are, I would say, the most severely underrepresented group in the media.

LT. GOVERNOR BUSTAMANTE: Sunny?

MR. SUNIL AGHI: First of all, I'd like to thank the Lieutenant Governor for creating this Commission. This is a courageous move on a politician to take a risky step of talking about hate, race, intolerance. Thank you, Lieutenant Governor.

As Indo Americans, we see Indo Americans portrayed as a 7-Eleven and a cab driver. Contrary to that, the Indo Americans have the highest per capita income, highest per capita education, and the lowest per capita crime, but that's not shown in the TV or the motion picture.

Listening to all of you distinguished panelists, it seems like talking to the studios and executives does not get the message across. And listening to one of the commissioners, in 1993, when the Civil Rights Commission subpoenaed these people to ask about diversity in the entertainment industry, those people are gone, according to Greg.

It seems to me FCC has some powers to regulate the broadcasting and radio and TV. If FCC created another department to really regulate the film industries, just like Department of Insurance, Transportation, Education, and forced everybody in the film industries to really include people of color and what kind of shows they can show may work.

I'd like to ask that from any one of you if you'd like to answer that.

MR. MATER: I think you'd run into a real First Amendment issue, and there's a former history of the Hayes Commission in movies and extreme control of movies. It's very tough because the FCC regulates broadcast licenses, though not networks directly, and that's the power. They have power over television stations and radio stations. There's no such analogous power with the feature film industry.

MR. MASUR: I know it was like an oil painting here, when I mentioned minority ownership before. There was no reaction from this panel and, frankly, I was startled by that. If the people in this room don't understand how important that is, that the concentration of power

into fewer and fewer corporations, the concentration of the distribution of information and the choice-making around these issues into fewer and fewer hands, if the people in this room don't understand that that's the absolute nexus on which this whole thing turns, then no one else is going to understand it. And that is the thing that the FCC can do. And Bill Kennard needs extraordinary amounts of support to push back against the studios, against the networks, who are pushing constantly to own more, to dominate markets completely so there are no voices but theirs available to anyone's ears.

If people of goodwill who understand this and are interested can't get motivated on this, especially at a critical moment in time when people are angry about this current television season where that anger could be channeled into political action that would be useful rather than political action which will be used less, which is to say let's regulate the content and the hiring practices, which is never going to happen. On the other hand, the ownership, that, the government actually has some say over. And I really exhort everybody in this room, including all of us on the panel, to focus on this as something that can be done in the near term and has to be pursued.

MS. TAYLOR: Just by way of information, I'd like to inform the commissioners there are two ways to get involved on this issue right now. One is with the Civil Rights Forum for Communication Policy which has put together ten recommendations to go to the FCC, and they're looking for support. I just spoke with them yesterday. You can find out more information actually through the Commission's president, Roberto Lubato(?), the Human Relations Commission.

There's another opportunity. I was in Washington, D.C., recently, at both the Congressional Hispanic Caucus and the Congressional Black Caucus, and they are coming together on this issue. Actually, there have been some joint resolutions passed. So I encourage you to plug into that effort as well.

LT. GOVERNOR BUSTAMANTE: Thank you...(hearing tape turned)...so we're going to hit two more commissioners. For those of you who don't know, Senator Tom Hayden has joined us here today and would like to make a comment. Then I've got one or two comments from the audience.

So Lester, could you--?

MR. LESTER OLMSTEAD-ROSE: Thank you.

I guess my question, as I've been watching the evolution of just this conversation which has started with a discussion which really centered on black-Latino, with kind of acknowledgement of Asians, and then as we've gone, it turns out that of course it's much broader than that. It's sexual orientation, it's Islam and other faiths. It's a whole bunch of disabilities, seniors, which kind of come out later.

I guess my question, which doesn't really need to be answered, but is how each of us in this discussion can be aware that as we fight for what we most personally feel passionately about, we can begin to adopt language which somehow is inclusive from the get-go.

And I say that, for example, when we talk about the studies. So it's not just language, it's the articles we write or the studies we do that we might have a particular issue around the African-American community, which is a very real issue, and yet, why not look at, in that same study or in that same advocacy, how do we include African-American people of different sexual orientations or gender identities or different ages or classes or faiths? And I'm just using that because that seems to be where in America we still seem to focus so much on the black and white. But I've seen that even here in this group, so it's really just an issue.

I don't know if we have time to respond to it, but how do we adopt language and approaches that are really more unified from the get-go? And I think in some way we wouldn't be fighting these battles in different little segmentations over and over and over.

MS. JOHNSON: Well, I know with the Screen Actors Guild, we are using the phrase "the American scene," which I think encompasses everything that makes this country so wonderful.

So to answer your question, at least through my Guild, we're using the term "the American scene," and that includes all Americans, regardless of sexual preference, religion, race, gender, disability.

MR. OLMSTEAD-ROSE: And I really appreciate that because ultimately what this discussion sounds like to me is that the media is not reflecting reality.

MS. JOHNSON: It's not.

MR. OLMSTEAD-ROSE: And if that's what we're really about, it sounds to me like that's what we all really want.

MR. VALDEZ: But it's affecting reality.

MS. JOHNSON: Exactly.

MR. TREVIÑO: But I would also caution, however, that that can also be used against us, and we've seen it used against us when NBC, a few years ago, when *The Cosby Show* was on, was talking about breaking the color barrier. And I wrote an article to the *Times* about that because I was saying, well, it's breaking the African-American color barrier, it's not doing anything for Latinos or Asian Americans or other groups. And I think that for too long Hollywood has said, 'We're going to do it for one group or one entity if we took care of all you guys,' and I think we have to be very cautious about that.

LT. GOVERNOR BUSTAMANTE: Okay, thank you. Constance?

MS. CONNIE RICE: Yes. Lieutenant Governor, thank you for pulling this Commission together. My name is Connie Rice and I'm a civil rights lawyer and I head up a project called The Advancement Project.

A couple of things I take from this presentation is we need a panel on news. And for those of us who do get the concentration issues, I had to say that unless you have the kind of money to lobby, our voices were completely drowned out. Until we get money out of our influence and access system our politicians don't respond. A number of us tried to get in the way of that \$70 billion giveaway that happened a couple of years ago of the airwaves, our airwaves, and it was like taking a dropper of water and putting it in the ocean. There was just absolutely no way to be heard. A lot of lobbying did go on but the power came with the money and the lobbying and we don't have it.

I've got to write a note to my mother. She didn't allow me to watch television when I was growing up. When *Star Trek* came on it was the first multi-racial show, and even though African Americans were normally cast as the aliens, at least we were there. I remember *Julia*. She let me watch one episode of that because that was in. I remember my dad liked Bill Cosby in *I Spy*, and I was allowed to watch one episode of that.

I think there's also the issue that today -- I looked at African-American youngsters. Particularly, poor African-American youngsters watch over eight hours of television a day and can't read. And so I want to keep that as part of the backdrop.

Ms. Johnson, I wish I could say that I'd love to represent you, if you get blacklisted or however excluded in some way, but I also know that bringing civil rights cases for the exclusion of black producers and minority producers and producers who can't seem to break through those relationships that Ms. Buggs Taylor talked about, it is a very much whom you know and

connections and who's in your neighborhood type of business. And judges won't touch it because it's creative license. It is the First Amendment. I've looked at it for ten years to try to help. I see that Paris Barkley, whom I went to college with, broke through, but there are very, very many more talented out there.

But to cut this short, I wanted to know, just to put on the table perhaps for further investigation, the impact of jobs leaving the United States. It must make it even more difficult for minority and other -- and plus poor white and other groups that aren't represented in any way. There's a huge class issue here as well and the images that are portrayed of lower income people in general. What's the impact of that? Because I imagine that makes it a much steeper incline for you.

And then, what about the idea -- since the jobs that do remain here are a big part of the industry, the job generating and wealth creation machinery in L.A. -- is there any way to get the industry interested in hooking up with community colleges, creating studios in community colleges, so that there's a job nexus? I know that DreamWorks is looking at that. I wonder if there are other studios that are looking at that as a way to generate jobs and connect poor communities, as well as poor whites, but poor African Americans, poor Latinos, poor Arab Americans, just lower income people who are completely unconnected with the wealth generation potential of Hollywood and who don't become either behind the camera or before the camera or writing and could. There's an enormous amount of talent that's missed.

LT. GOVERNOR BUSTAMANTE: First, the State of California tracks very carefully the impact of the number of jobs that are leaving California, and there's over a billion dollars worth of business that's in Canada right now.

MR. MASUR: It's 2.8 actually. It's 2.8 billion. I'll be happy to send you the study we did on this.

LT. GOVERNOR BUSTAMANTE: I'd like to see it because the latest number I saw was \$1 billion.

MR. MASUR: It's 2.8 billion, and with the multiplier effect, which is the way the industry impacts the community it's in, it comes out to \$10.3 billion has left the United States. Now, one billion, that's too small a number for California because California represents approximately 78 or 80 percent of all production in this country. So I would say the number's closer to 2.3 leaving California.

MS. JOHNSON: And also with runaway productions we must be very aware of, these productions are running away to Canada, New Zealand, and Australia, and you're not going to see the American scene represented in these countries.

MR. MASUR: Yeah, there are no--

MS. JOHNSON: It'd be hard to find.

MR. MASUR: Yeah, there are some black people there. There are virtually no Latinos. There are plenty of Asians, but they're not casting them. They're not filling out the background with them. Every show that gets shot in Canada is a virtually all-white background.

The other thing that it does, and I just want to make reference to something that was said just a minute ago about what municipalities can do when they come to you to build roads and tax incentives and stuff. I will tell you, this is something that should be thought about very, very carefully before it's employed. Right now, what we need in this state is incentives. What we need in this country is incentives to keep the jobs here, because there are Maquilladoras being created not just in Canada but in Rosarita and in very far-flung places. This industry is totally capital intensive and can move anywhere it wants to. There are no bricks and mortars. Those studios are a bunch of real estate holdings and they can be converted into amusement parks or housing projects and make a lot more money for the companies than the studios do.

LT. GOVERNOR BUSTAMANTE: Senator Hayden.

SENATOR TOM HAYDEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I came by for two reasons. One, this is my district and place that does a great deal of work trying to deal with problems of hate and discrimination. And also, I've authored legislation, which is on the Governor's desk, which creates statutory authority and funding for two more hate-related commissions that link with this one. Some might say there's too many, but I don't think there's been enough discussion, particularly of the armed hate groups, the militias, that are involved in creating the atmosphere in which individuals seemingly as lone individuals carry out acts of hate. So I'm very hopeful the Governor will sign that and that these commissions can work together. One in the Attorney General's office working on criminal justice issues, the other chaired by Governor Deukmejian and Warren Christopher with appointees from the Legislature.

Secondly, I wanted to congratulate the Lieutenant Governor for being in the forefront of these human relations issues and having the courage to take on the issue of racism in Hollywood,

because L.A. is very much a company town and you don't see these discussions occurring, generated in Los Angeles, and you won't. Hollywood will come to Sacramento asking for a hundred million dollar tax break, allegedly to keep jobs here, but if you say what kind of jobs and will Hollywood do anything about racism, the answer is 'Well, that's protected by the First Amendment,' which is a false and misleading argument. If Hollywood wants subsidies to keep jobs in Hollywood and in Los Angeles, those who give the subsidies have every reason to ask some public interest and spirited questions of the kind that you're asking.

To believe otherwise is to somehow think that before this phenomenon of runaway production occurred -- and by the way, I ran on this issue in 1982. It's always with us, and I've become a little more jaundiced, perhaps influenced by my Canadian wife, that somehow before this runaway phenomenon, there was really a multicultural character to the Hollywood scene and that it was really dissipated and whitened by the loss of jobs to Canada. It's ridiculous. It's not true. There's more need for facts and less need for fire on this issue. It goes back a long time. There's the image of the drunken Irishman and so on, long before the concentration of power of these studios.

The thing that I think is most telling that Counselor Rice indicated is there's a class as well as an ethnic and a racial issue here. For instance, the whites -- and I'm trying to get rid of the idea of whiteness. I think it's a difficult label unless you're a supremacist. The whites all have in their background, generally speaking, whether they're Jewish, Irish, Italian, or whatever, a history of discrimination, inferiority, and participation in gangs and violence and illegal activity, whether it's bootlegging or whatever, in their background. That is marvelously sanitized as we look out through the police programs of police picking up young gang bangers who are not white. We forget where we came from.

It's so twisted that the most rewarded and honored program this year is *The Sopranos*, which extols the life, the suburban life of a violent and criminal Italian-American family in the suburbs. And it's a wonderful program, but consider, for instance, what the reception would be to a program called 'The Homies,' a day in the life of a family of members of the Diez y Ocho, the 18th Street gang, or perhaps Marisol Vatruccha(?). Young immigrants struggling from violence in the Central America to violence in Los Angeles, trying to send their children to community college and keep the sordid past of their uncle in the closet.

It's impossible, and it will not happen overnight. But I congratulate you very much for the effort to keep the spotlight. As I said, it will take the State of California to lead Hollywood out of the white ages, and it will not happen within Los Angeles. Los Angeles is very much wired. How many of you are from Los Angeles? You know what I mean.

This is an extraordinary discussion. I don't know if it was this gentleman, but the *Times* did a brilliant analysis. It's only too rare but they did a great analysis of the shameful white-only cast of characters on television and pointed out the insidious unconscious nature of the problem. It is not racism, in my judgment. Somebody said it's racism. The effects of racism on the part of people who themselves experienced the struggle against racism and think of themselves in their conscious mind, which we know is about one percent of our mind, but they think of themselves in their conscious mind as civil rights advocates, and therefore, the problem is all the more illusive because it's institutionalized and it's unconscious. But if you measure by outcomes, you see that in some ways it's worse than thirty years ago. Worse. And therefore, action and deeds as well as contemplation and research are very, very much needed, and I hope that this gentleman, who in any audience is an inspiring, idealistic, and stabilizing leader, will help us get through this transition that we have to make in California.

LT. GOVERNOR BUSTAMANTE: Thank you, Tom.

There are two questions from the audience. One is, do we know how many minority households are part of the Nielsen ratings, and can more minorities be included that would then help programming?

Anybody have any comments?

MS. JOHNSON: Well, it's very few, and the Nielsen process is assumed that it's random, which many of us here feel that -- I don't know how random that can be. But very few homes are minority homes.

MR. VALDEZ: There's three different kinds of Nielsens also. There's the general market Nielsens, there's NHSI, which NHI is the broadcast version for Spanish language television. The sampling is totally biased towards a Spanish-dominant household, so again, you can't really effectively sample because it's for Spanish media. So that's fine, but the English language Hispanic is completely left out of the equation.

MS. _____: How do you change that? How do we change that? I don't know that much about the Nielsens, so how do you--?

MR. MASUR: Well, they're responding -- I hate to keep bringing us, dragging us back, kicking and screaming to this, but they're responding to the needs as expressed by the advertisers, and that's what they're doing it for. I mean, they're out there to identify demographics that are identified as ones that will spend large dollars when they're impacted by advertising.

One of the great shibboleths that's out there that the advertising industry continues to live under -- I hate to bring age back into this conversation but I will -- is that people over the age of 35 won't change brands, won't be affected by advertising. My mother, until she died, would buy every single thing she ever saw advertised on television once. If it was no good she wouldn't buy it again.

The fact is that this is no longer the case with the population in this country, and that people over 50 control 85 percent of the wealth in this country, or 80 percent of the wealth in this country, and the people who are trying to sell things don't bother talking to them. I mean, it's an amazing fact.

LT. GOVERNOR BUSTAMANTE: The second question was -- this is for you, Richard. Are the statistics that you've quoted based solely on prime time, or does it include late night and daytime TV?

MR. MASUR: Well, it includes all work done under Screen Actors Guild, under -- well, our television and theatrical contracts and we separate out television. So it's anything made for television under the Screen Actors Guild agreement. We cover very little that's done for daytime. That's mostly covered by our sister union AFTRA. So it wouldn't include that much daytime. And also, we have a separate series of numbers for commercials which, frankly, the numbers are much higher on especially for African Americans and still pathetically low for Asians and for -- Latinos are better actually because we include in there Spanish language commercials. So there is significant employment there.

But again, I want to underscore. The numbers that I quoted you are raw employment figures. And it says there's a lot of jobs going to African Americans, for example. It does not speak to content, to quality, or size of role. That's partly why we're doing this study that Anne-Marie described, because we want to try and get a handle around that as well. We can't do that in our casting data reports. They're not set up to do that.

But I think if people understand that -- it's a mistake to say we've rolled back, we're in a horrible situation. What the Guild's focus has always been is jobs. So we don't get into what's the quality of the sitcoms on any given network. There are people who are in a much better position to comment on that than we are. We're happy that our members are working. That's what we're there to do.

But on the other hand, the African-American community and our African-American members have the luxury, because of the numbers of jobs, of actually considering these questions of size and quality and content of role. Whereas, some of the other populations, the Latino-Hispanics, and you'll forgive me, but the Muslims and Indo Americans, you're not going to get any sympathy from me if people are working, and we get more people working. You know, we've all played gas station attendants at various points in our development. I mean, Jews did, Italians did, Irish guys did, and that's the point. I mean, first you've got to get in there, then you've got to get the work under your belt, and you've got to get some trained people who have experience, and then you move up through the ranks and you go further.

The Guild doesn't focus on -- I shouldn't say we don't do it -- but we don't focus on the quality and the content. We focus primarily on the availability of work and the access to that work.

LT. GOVERNOR BUSTAMANTE: Okay, thank you.

First, I'd like to, on behalf of the Commission, say thank you to each of the panelists. Thank you for your courage. Thank you for what you do, the thoughtfulness under which you've presented all of the arguments, the fact that we have such articulate, thoughtful people in these areas. I just can't imagine that this can't go to the next level. In fact, we should try to get yet another Rick Mater and then we'll get the second and the third and the fourth and the fifth.

And I think that as this Commission evolves, this is one of many subjects that I think we're going to discuss. And in the end, I think as we designed the Commission, how do we develop best practices and then conflict resolution strategies? And how do the different industries and the different parts of California affect us being able to in fact be one California? That's clearly where I think we'd like to go.

It's been a very interesting discussion. I don't know what the commissioners think, but I would, on their behalf, say that I think it's been a very interesting conversation. Thank you for coming.

We are going to have a meeting in January, for the benefit of the commissioners. At that meeting we are going to be discussing different legislative proposals that are going to be discussed in the Legislature for next year. I'm going to be passing out a little sheet to both sides. If there's anybody who would like to be involved, and probably will end up being a couple of different meetings, separate, sort of as a working group to try to aggregate some of the information and also talk about how to develop the agenda for the next meeting, I'd appreciate anybody who would like to participate in that activity.

But also to the commissioners, this is a very difficult issue to attack on behalf of California. But as I said in my opening comments, I can't think of any work that's better to do for California. California, I don't believe, can ever achieve its real greatness until everybody is incorporated and we think of ourselves as one California. So until we do that, I think the work still needs to be done.

Some of you came from a long distance. Thank you. Some of you changed your schedules around significantly. Thank you. And I hope that come January we'll enter into yet another very interesting discussion. I don't know if you've met all of the legislators but they're not just like Tom and I. They come in all colors and sizes and different kinds of perspectives. So it'll be interesting to hear how they discuss their legislative proposals and their ideas for one California.

Thank you all for coming today. I look forward to seeing you in January.

--oo0oo--